

COUNTY COUNCIL: MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, 7th December 2010
Time: 2.00 pm – 5.55 pm
Place: Shire Hall, Cambridge
Present: Councillor L J Oliver (Chairman)

Councillors S Austen, J D Batchelor, I C Bates, N Bell, K Bourke, B Brooks-Gordon, D Brown, F Brown, P Brown, R Butcher, J Clark, N Clarke, S Criswell, M Curtis, P J Downes, J Dutton, R Farrer, N Guyatt, S Gymer, G Harper, N Harrison, D Harty, S Hoy, W Hunt, C Hutton, J D Jenkins, E Kadić, G Kenney, S King, L W McGuire, V McGuire, A K Melton, R Moss-Eccardt, L Nethsingha, T Orgee, J Palmer, D R Pegram, J A Powley, P Read, P Reeve, J E Reynolds, K Reynolds, T Sadiq, S Sedgwick-Jell, C Shepherd, M Shuter, M Smith, T Stone, S Tierney, J Tuck, S van de Ven, R West, F Whelan, S Whitebread, K Wilkins, M Williamson, G Wilson, L J Wilson and F H Yeulett

Apologies: Councillors C Carter, G Heathcock, S Johnstone, S G M Kindersley, V Lucas, I Manning and A Pellew

125. MINUTES: 19TH OCTOBER 2010

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 19th October 2010 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

126. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman made a number of announcements as set out in **Appendix A**.

127. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared personal interests under Paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct:

Councillor	Minute	Details
Batchelor	133	Member of Linton Action for Youth
Jenkins	133	Non-Executive Director of Cambridgeshire Community Services
J Reynolds	131	Chairman Renewables East
Whelan	133	Parent of two children at Comberton Village College Board member of the National Autistic Society for Cambridgeshire Associate member of COPE (Cambridgeshire Older People's Enterprise)
Wilkins	129	Member of Cambridgeshire Police Authority
	130	Associate member of COPE
	133	
G Wilson	131	On flood and climate change issues as an Employee of the Environment Agency

128. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Council noted that no questions had been received from members of the public by the deadline.

129. WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Nine written questions had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 9.4, as set out in **Appendix B**.

130. ORAL QUESTIONS

Twelve oral questions were asked under Council Procedure Rule 9.1, as set out in **Appendix C**. In response to these questions, the following items were identified for further action:

- Councillor M McGuire, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, agreed to arrange to include Community Transport Schemes on the Addenbrooke's Access Road automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) camera system exemption list.
- Councillor M McGuire, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, agreed to provide Councillor D Jenkins with an update on the B1049 cycle scheme, and the project to put a safer crossing across the A14 using Section 106 funding.
- Councillor F Yeulett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing, agreed to update Councillor K Wilkins on the status of plans to award block contracts to residential care providers.

131. MOTIONS

One motion had been submitted under Council Procedure Rule 10.

(a) Motion from Councillor S Whitebread

It was proposed by Councillor Whitebread and seconded by Councillor Bell:

This Council notes

- That 'meeting the challenges of climate change' is a strategic objective of the authority.
- That the most recent Internal Audit Report gave only 'Limited Assurance' that the Council's Climate Change Strategy was operating successfully and commented that "the issue of climate change is not being embraced by the whole organisation as they would expect to see, given its strategic importance to the Council."
- That whilst significant progress has been made in collecting data on carbon emissions, and targets for reductions have been set, the Council has failed to make any progress in cutting its carbon footprint, with emissions rising by 2% over the past year from 88,641 to 90,395 tonnes.

- That the recent change in the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme (CRCEES) will increase the financial burden on the Council, with costs estimated at £622K in 2012 and likely to rise substantially in subsequent years.

Council therefore calls on the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment to:

- Urgently reappraise the Council's approach to the CRCEES and invest smartly in carbon dioxide (CO₂) reduction measures this year to reduce the cost to the Council.
- Take more radical action on cost neutral measures to cut CO₂ such as reducing business mileage.
- Improve monitoring by including CO₂ emissions in the Corporate Scorecard of the Integrated Resources and Performance Report that goes to Cabinet each month.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Orgee and seconded by Councillor Butcher:

Second bullet delete "the most recent" and add an before "Internal Audit Report" and ", in April 2010," just after.

Third bullet delete "whilst" and the wording after "set," and add dioxide after carbon and but it is too soon to draw definite conclusions after "set".

Fourth bullet delete "recent change in the" and replace the wording after "Council," with but details of the scheme have not yet been finalised.

Fifth bullet replace "Urgently reappraise" with Review, add when final details of the scheme are known after "CRCEES", add continue to before "invest" and delete "smartly", and delete "this year".

Delete bullets six and seven and add the following bullet, Continue to take action to cut emissions and provide appropriate performance information on a regular basis.

Following discussion, the amendment on being put to the vote was carried.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives in favour; Liberal Democrats, Independent, Labour, Green and UKIP members against; the Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained]

Following discussion, the substantive motion as amended and detailed below, on being put to the vote was carried.

This Council notes

- That 'meeting the challenges of climate change' is a strategic objective of the authority.

- That an Internal Audit Report, in April 2010, gave only 'Limited Assurance' that the Council's Climate Change Strategy was operating successfully and commented that "the issue of climate change is not being embraced by the whole organisation as they would expect to see, given its strategic importance to the Council."
- That significant progress has been made in collecting data on carbon dioxide emissions, and targets for reductions have been set, but it is too soon to draw definite conclusions.
- That the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency Scheme (CRCEES) will increase the financial burden on the Council, but details of the scheme have not yet been finalised.

Council therefore calls on the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment to:

- Review the Council's approach to the CRCEES when final details of the scheme are known and continue to invest in carbon dioxide (CO₂) reduction measures to reduce the cost to the Council.
- Continue to take action to cut emissions and provide appropriate performance information on a regular basis.

[Voting pattern: Conservatives in favour; Liberal Democrats, Independent, Labour, Green and UKIP members against; the Chairman and Vice-Chairman abstained]

132. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES

It was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor Oliver, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Powley and agreed unanimously to make the following appointments to Committees and outside organisations:

- (i) to replace Councillor C Shepherd with Councillor D Jenkins on the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee
- (ii) to replace Councillor A Pellew with Councillor C Shepherd as the full member on the Cambridge Area Joint Committee and Councillor A Pellew to now be the substitute member.
- (iii) To replace Councillor N Harrison on the following:
 - i) Councillor C Shepherd on the Joint Development Control Committee for Cambridge Fringes Joint Committee
 - ii) Councillor P Downes on Service Appeals Committee
- iv) to replace Councillor L Wilson with Councillor J West on the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee
- v) to replace Councillor J West with Councillor G Harper as a substitute member on the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee

133. REPORTS OF CABINET MEETINGS – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

(a) Report of the meeting held on 26th October 2010

The Council noted information reports on:

- Issues Arising from Scrutiny – Children and Young People’s Services
Scrutiny Committee: Member Led Review of Children and Young People’s Services in New Communities
- Street Lighting Private Finance Initiative (PFI) – Award of Contract
- Winter Policy Review
- Integrated Resources and Performance Report – August 2010
- Joint Interim Statement on Planning by the Cambridgeshire Authorities and Future Strategic Planning for Cambridgeshire
- Cambridgeshire Guided Busway

Members commented and asked questions of the relevant Cabinet members about these items. In response to these questions, the following items were identified for further action:

- Councillor R Pegram, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, agreed to provide Councillor G Wilson with details of the total cost of the Street Lighting PFI project.
- Councillor R Pegram, the Cabinet Member for Growth, Infrastructure and Strategic Planning, agreed to provide Councillor T Stone with details of the possible charges for Parish Councils for the maintenance fees and energy costs of street lights as a result of the Street Lighting PFI project.

(b) Report of the meeting held on 16th November 2010

The Council noted information reports on:

- Petition requesting that the County Council take measures to reduce speeding on Bell Road, Bottisham
- Integrated Youth Support Service
- Cambourne Section 106 Agreement
- Integrated Resources and Performance Report – September 2010
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) Phase 4 Summary Report
- Great Haddon Planning Application – Draft Council Response
- Cambridge Local Investment Plan – Consultation Draft

- Sharing Buildings and Pooling Assets in Support of Localism, Growth Partnership Working and Efficiency
- Local Government Shared Services Update
- Cambridgeshire Guided Busway
- Delegation from Cabinet to Cabinet Members/Officers

Members commented and asked questions of the relevant Cabinet members about these items. In response to these questions, the following item was identified for further action:

- Councillor M McGuire, the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, agreed to write to the Bell Road petitioners to apologise for his lack of involvement in the response provided to them.

Chairman

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

PEOPLE

Congratulations to Councillor Pellew and especially his wife on the birth of their new baby boy.

The Chairman had the honour of being able to convey the County's congratulations on the recent announcement that Prince William is to marry Kate Middleton next year. The marriage will take place on Friday 29th April next year in Westminster Abbey. The date will be a public holiday.

AWARDS

Kick Ash

Kick Ash, a Cambridgeshire pilot programme to reduce smoking in the under 16's, by the Chartered Institute of Public Relations has won a silver Pride Award beating some stiff competition in the Public Sector Communications category, including the national ChangeForLife campaign. The programme was developed through partnership working between the Council and NHS Cambridgeshire and is peer led by young people from Bottisham Village College. Kick Ash encourages young people to lead on activities, including promoting the campaign in the local media, lobbying local MPs for support, preventing underage sales of tobacco, supporting younger people at risk of smoking and helping to develop stop smoking services for younger people.

Kick Ash is now being rolled out to four other schools - Swavesey Village College; Sir Harry Smith Community College, Whittlesey; St Peters School, Huntingdon; and the Manor School, Cambridge.

"Name the Gritter" competition

This competition to name the newest vehicles in the County Council's fleet of 38 road treatment trucks produced a very successful response from school children in South Cambridgeshire and resulted in some highly original names.

The competition winners were invited to a naming ceremony at the Whittlesford Highways Depot where eight children were presented with Road Safety "goody bags", as well as having the chance to look around their "named" gritter, have their picture taken with it and take a ride in their gritter.

The winners were:

- Gritannia - Catherine Humphrey, Great Wilbraham Primary
- Snow Patrol - Kane Backhouse, Histon Primary & Bethany Bryant, Elsworth Primary
- Gritterbug - Alexia Kadri, Pendragon Primary
- I.C. Gritter - Julia Reall, Pendragon Primary
- Snowy Joey - Thomas Wright, Bar Hill C.P. School
- Skidon't - Georgina Marshall, Hatton Park Primary
- Snow Worries - Finley Izzard, Great Wilbraham

Skills for Care Accolades Awards

The Transitions Team were highly commended for their work at an awards ceremony held in London last week to beat off stiff competition to make the final shortlist of three in the prestigious Skills for Care Accolades Awards in the category for 'Most innovative workforce development practice in a specialist service'. The Accolades Awards celebrate the achievement of the very best social care providers from across England.

CAM Rider Enterprise Award

Two Chatteris women were crowned winners of the CAM Rider Enterprise Award at the youth charity's Celebrate Success Awards on 22nd November.

Carla Shand 29, and Olivia Steers 28, went from struggling to raise their families on benefits to running their own successful cleaning company, The Cleaning Fairies, with help from The Prince's Trust. Both were unemployed single mothers, struggling to survive on benefits. Carla had helped in her parents' cleaning business but, when her mother suffered a long-term illness and died, Carla struggled to cope. At the same time, Olivia also lost a close friend. The young women, who had known each other for years, supported one another through this difficult time. They decided they wanted to provide a good life for their children and needed to come off benefits. It was at this point they approached The Prince's Trust for support to set up their own cleaning business. The Trust saw their potential, offering a business mentor, Robert Moorhouse, and a £4,500 loan which helped launch The Cleaning Fairies.

The Prince's Trust Celebrate Success Awards honour the achievements of disadvantaged young people supported by The Trust who have succeeded against the odds, improved their chances in life and had a positive impact on their local community. The award ceremony took place at West Road Concert Hall in Cambridge, and was hosted by entrepreneur and TV personality Raef Bjayou. Youth charity The Prince's Trust helps change young lives giving practical and financial support, developing key workplace skills such as confidence and motivation. It works with 14- to 30-year-olds who have struggled at school, have been in care, are long-term unemployed or have been in trouble with the law.

SERVICE DEVELOPMENTS

Children's Centre, Trumpington

A new Children's Centre in Trumpington at the Fawcett Primary School was recently opened which will provide valuable services to the children in this area of Cambridge.

Addenbrooke's Road

The official opening of the Addenbrooke's Access Road (called Addenbrooke's Road) Road took place on Wednesday 27 October. The new £25 million, 1.5 mile long route connects Hauxton Road to Shelford Road, and continues onto the Cambridge Biomedical Campus using a new bridge over the London to Cambridge railway line. It includes both on and off road cycle lanes as well as facilities for pedestrians. The road also helps unlock land for new housing developments in the area. The route is proving to be very successful with a noticeable reduction in traffic on Hauxton Road. The Road has been brought forward with a combination of Government and developer funding and has been planned by a close partnership of the County Council, the City Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons.

Cycle route schemes

The Cycle Cambridge team has completed and opened a number of new cycle routes in recent weeks. The routes play a significant role in reducing congestion and encouraging more cycle journeys in Cambridge and the surrounding area. The new routes opened include:

- Dry Drayton to Bar Hill
- New Bit Common, Cambridge
- Babraham to Sawston
- Whittlesford to Sawston
- Lode to Bottisham
- Fen Ditton to Horningsea (due to open before Christmas 2010)

A number of other routes are also nearing completion and will be opened shortly.

OTHER MATTERS

The annual assessment by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) has concluded that Adult Social Care Services in Cambridgeshire are performing well above expectation and in some cases have been rated as excellent. The CQC report praises staff at all levels and Councillors for their 'clear vision in respect of adult social care' and the authority's commitment to tackling inequalities across the county and its work with partners to provide services and support to the diverse Cambridgeshire community. The Council's ability to concentrate on service delivery in the face of pressures on the budget is also singled out for mention. Of the seven assessment areas, the services provided by Cambridgeshire County Council and in partnership with other agencies were universally rated as performing 'well' with two highlighted as excellent.

Excellent ratings were awarded for:

- Improved quality of life
- Making a positive contribution

Performing well ratings were achieved for:

- Improved health and well-being
- Increased choice and control
- Freedom from discrimination and harassment
- Economic well-being
- Maintaining personal dignity and respect

Overall Adults Social Care Services in Cambridgeshire were rated as performing well.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
WRITTEN QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.4**

Question from Councillor R Moss Eccardt to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

The planning permission for the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (CBC) (and nearby fringe developments) depended on the creation of the Addenbrooke's Access Road (AAR) which was also conditioned to not become a 'rat run'. A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) has been made. Confusion abounds as to the enforcement regime for this TRO. Could the Lead Member provide a succinct and correct description of how the TRO will be enforced and, if not, will he consider his position?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

As Councillor Moss-Eccardt states, the planning permission for the AAR contained a condition that measures were to be put in place to prevent the route being used as a through route.

To satisfy this condition, the county council, working in partnership with the hospital Trust, the police and the MediPark developers on the Addenbrooke's site, has made a traffic regulation order which makes it an offence to drive through the hospital site without requiring access to the site itself thereby preventing the use of the AAR and the roads in the hospital site as a through route.

The traffic order was implemented through the normal legal procedures for traffic regulation orders and as no objections were raised at the consultation and formal advertisement stage, the order was made under delegated powers.

As with any other 'access only' traffic order, the Addenbrooke's site order is enforceable by the police through normal enforcement operations. However, to supplement these operations, the developers of the MediPark development have funded the installation of an automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) camera system.

The ANPR system records motor vehicle registration plates at all entry and exit points to the hospital site and these are then cross matched and the journey times through the site monitored to detect through motor vehicle movements. The camera system meets all current relevant Government design and operational protocols.

If vehicles are found to be using the hospital roads as a through route, the number plate details are then provided to the police for enforcement purposes. Initial enforcement action will involve the issuing of warning letters to registered keepers of the vehicles. If recipients of warning letters consider that they have a legitimate need to access the hospital site, the warning letter includes a form that drivers can complete and return to the hospital authorities explaining their need to access the site. Once verified by the hospital authorities, the vehicle registration plate details will be entered onto the camera system database to avoid further enforcement action.

If drivers fail to respond to the warning letters, any further detection by the camera system could then result in prosecution action by the police by the issuing of a fixed penalty notice.

Given Councillor Moss-Eccardt's concerns over possible confusion, officers were asked to provide an updated FAQ document on the access restriction on our web pages now that the AAR is open and this has been circulated to all county and district members.

Question from Councillor Moss-Eccardt to the Cabinet Member for Customer Service and Transformation Councillor Criswell

If a member chooses to use a non County e-mail address, a member of the public will be told of the 'correct address' the first time they attempt to send to the obvious firstname.lastname@cambridgeshire.gov.uk. address and then have to remember the correct address forever as they will never be told again. Is this level of customer service acceptable in his opinion?

Response from Cllr Steve Criswell, Cabinet Member for Customer Service & Transformation

Cllr Moss-Eccardt is one of 25 County Councillors who have chosen, for their own personal reasons, to use an e-mail address other than the County Council address for their correspondence. Initially where members chose to use their own email addresses the standard MS Exchange based "out of office" functionality was used to send an automatic response to any person emailing the obsolete xx.xx@cambridgeshire.gov.uk to alert them to the fact that the email address is no longer in use.

This response is sent only once and if a correspondent e-mails again, they do not get the message repeated. This is part of the standard Microsoft "Out of Office" email functionality which restricts multiple "out of office" responses in order to prevent "mail loops" which can in certain circumstances cause a mail server to "crash". However, having evaluated the potential service outage risk in relation the need for the digital accessibility of Members the existing approach has been reviewed and a revised process agreed. An automated rule can be set up which will send back a message to each correspondent, regardless of how many times they e-mail the obsolete inbox. Email traffic will be monitored to the relevant email inboxes on an exceptional basis and the automated rule will be suspended in the event that high traffic levels threaten service availability. This option will be restricted to Members only, and all Members who are using non-County Council email addresses will be offered this option should they so wish. This has already been set up for Cllr Moss-Eccardt as a result of his request.

The message that will appear is as follows:

This e-mail address is not in use; please re-send your message to xx@yy

I believe that overcomes the issue that Cllr Moss-Eccardt has raised.

Question from Councillor Moss Eccardt to the Leader of the Council Councillor Jill Tuck

At the last Council meeting a number of commitments were made by her Cabinet. Could she enumerate them and provide an update on progress, please?

Response from Councillor J Tuck Leader of the Council

At Council on 19th October, there were two commitments made by Cabinet Members to supply written answers to questions raised by members.

1. Councillor Harty undertook to supply an answer to Councillor Kindersley's oral question on the provision of a secondary school in Cambourne.

2. Councillor Pegram undertook to supply a written answer to Councillor Bourke's question about the current cost of the guided busway project on an equivalent basis **to the original** estimated cost. The question had been asked in the context of the report of the Cabinet meeting of 28th September.

Both answers to the above commitments were circulated to all members via e-mail on 30th November and were placed on the internet with the minutes on 1st December.

Councillor M McGuire undertook to follow up matters raised by Councillor van de Ven in relation to her oral question. She had asked about winter gritting in relation to Great and Little Chishill Parish Council. There was no commitment to supply a written reply, and Councillor McGuire has been able to assure me that the matter had been followed up.

Question from Councillor Bourke to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor Mac McGuire

In the Winter Maintenance Review, maps containing the proposed gritting network were sent out to county, district and parish councillors, for comment. These maps included the detail of the "reduced network", which would be used in the event of there being a shortage of grit, as happened last year. In the case of Cambridge city, the entirety of the city inside the inner ring road was excluded from the reduced gritting network. In practice what this meant was that if there was a prolonged period of extreme bad weather, which sufficiently depleted the stockpiles of grit, the County Council's gritting lorries would not grit a single stretch of carriageway inside the inner ring road of Cambridge. Will the cabinet member please clarify whether this remains the case?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

The criteria for the reduced routes for winter service included

- A and B Roads
- Links to A&E hospitals and other emergency services
- Strategic locations as defined by Go East
- Roads adjacent to major fen drains (added specifically as a geographic issue).

The majority of these reflect advice from Central Government with the addition from this authority of roads adjacent to deep drains. Recognising that this reduction would only happen if there was a significant problem with salt supply and that the area within the ring road of Cambridge is a 20mph zone this area has not been included in the reduced network. There are many roads in the county, both urban and non-urban which would be similarly affected if there was a salt shortage. The decision to go to a reduced network would not be one that I would relish having to take and so I have challenged officers to ensure they have done all they can to ensure resilience of supply.

However, this year we are trialling a new salt/sugar solution (which is not included within the Central Government monitoring data), on some of the pedestrian areas and cycle ways across the county and whilst we have supplies of this material we will continue to treat these areas.

Question from Councillor Nethsingha to the Cabinet Member for Learning Councillor Harty

How many appeals there have been for Comberton Village College school places this year?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

To date there have been 12 appeals lodged for this school this academic year. The breakdown by year group is shown below;

- 3 for Year 8
- 7 for Year 9
- 1 for Year 10
- 1 for Year 11

How many were successful, and how many unsuccessful?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

Of the appeals heard 8 were successful, a place became available in Year 8, which was offered and accepted by the parent, and an appeal for Year 9 was withdrawn by the parent.

What the cost of each appeal is to the council?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

Comberton Village College is a foundation school and, therefore, its own admission authority and is responsible for its own appeals. However, the Governing Body of the school choose to buy in the appeal service from the Local Authority Admissions Team through a Service Level Agreement. The college currently pay a fee of £3,260 a year for this service.

Could I also have the same information for Coleridge?

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

To date there have been 4 appeals lodged for this school this academic year. The breakdown by year group is shown below:

- 3 for Year 7
- 1 for Year 8

None of these appeals were heard, as places became available before the proposed hearing date. Coleridge, like Comberton Village College, are their own admission authority and is responsible for its own appeal. Like Comberton, the Governing Body of the school choose to buy in the appeal service from the LA Admissions Team through a Service Level Agreement. The college currently pay a fee of £3,260 a year for this service.

How many children are coming in from Cambourne to go to school in Cambridge City everyday, I am assuming no primary children fall into this category, but if there are any primary school children could I have those figures separately.

Response from Councillor Harty, Cabinet Member for Learning

There are currently 17 Cambourne secondary age children being transported to Cambridge City Secondary schools. However there could be some children coming to Cambridge schools from Cambourne as a result of parental preference.

Cambourne primary aged children, who cannot presently get into one of the Cambourne schools, are currently being transported to Hardwick. The admissions team are not aware of any coming into Cambridge who have been turned away from Cambourne. However, again, there could be some children coming to Cambridge schools from Cambourne as a result of parental preference.

Questions from Councillor K Wilkins to the Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Health and Wellbeing F. Yeulett

To ask Councillor Yeulett what level he expects National Indicator (NI) 130 "Social Care Clients receiving Self Directed Support" to reach at the end of each of Q3 and Q4?

Response from Councillor Yeulett Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Health and Wellbeing

The performance to the end of November is 43%. This puts us at 10th in the Country out of 152 Local Authorities with adult social care responsibility, and ahead of the government requirement to achieve 30% by the end of March 2011. The expected performance at Q3 is 45% and at Q4 is 48%. In recognition that Cambridgeshire is implementing a total change from the old care management system to the new self directed support system, the target for 2010/11 was set at 80% at the beginning of the financial year. This target was set prior to the introduction of the improved model of reablement and greater promotion of Assistive Technology and telehealth equipment. These initiatives have an impact on the target by reducing the numerator i.e. the number of people who could receive services through self directed support, but not reducing the denominator i.e. the number of people in receipt of community services. It is accepted that given these other influences, the target of 80% will not be achieved but this does not diminish the positive progress made in Cambridgeshire.

What is holding up progress to bring NI 131 "Delayed Transfers of Care from Hospitals" down towards the target? What action is he personally taking to ensure the number of delayed discharges is reduced?

Response from Councillor Yeulett Cabinet Member Adult Social Care Health and Wellbeing

Officers across the whole NHS and adult social care system are working collaboratively to reduce the delayed transfers for care from hospital. Performance at the end of October was 11.8 delays per week. This brings the performance close to the performance in April 2009 when it was 11.1 and is a significant improvement from February 2010, when the performance was 16.9. Chief Executives from the NHS and our Executive Director, Community and Adult Services meet on a monthly basis to review progress with the whole system approach that is being led by Directors from each organisation. Recognising that we often see an increase in the number of delays during the winter, linked to increased numbers of admissions to the acute hospitals, a number of joint actions have been taken to mitigate this. These include a single team managing the process of discharge through Addenbrooke's and a range of joint investments in voluntary and independent sector providers to reduce avoidable admissions and create additional short term capacity for the winter months.

I proactively monitor the progress of this work through my briefings with the Executive Director, Community & Adults Services and Service Director, Strategy & commissioning (Adult Social Care) and I have confidence that these actions will continue to support the downwards trend towards the target of 8.9 for 2010/11.

Question from Cllr Bell to the Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment Councillor Orgee.

I note that this Council spent £6.4 million on Land Fill Tax last year, and the cost is currently £48 per ton. The Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough (RECAP) figures for 2008/9 show that East Cambridgeshire District Council had to send 63% of its household waste to landfill, or 18,346 tons, which would cost £880k at £48 per ton.

In 2008/9 East Cambridgeshire District Council (ECDC) had a recycling rate of 37% of household waste which compared very unfavourably with all the other District Councils in the County, particularly Huntingdon District Council whose rate was 58%. Would Councillor Orgee join with me in expressing concern that, while the other Districts in Cambridgeshire are increasing their household waste recycling rates ECDC's rate is projected to fall to 35%, missing their agreed recycling target, and that the increased cost of Landfill Tax will fall on this authority? While this increase may be reduced by the introduction of the Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) processing plant at Donarbon would he remind Members of ECDC that this new plant has been set up on the basis of all local authorities meeting their agreed recycling targets and that when ECDC reduce their recycling service to residents, ostensibly to 'save money', that the subsequent reduction in recycling that inevitably occurs imposes increased costs on this Council and therefore on the taxpayers of the County, including those in East Cambridgeshire District?

Response from Councillor Orgee, Cabinet Member for Economy and the Environment

As a Waste Disposal Authority (WDA), the County Council is responsible for the disposal of all municipal waste; this comprises the residual (black bin/ sack) waste collected by the 5 District Councils (operating as Waste Collection Authorities (WCA)) and the waste from the 9 Recycling Centres across the county. The County Council also receives all the food and green waste (collected in green bins/ brown sacks) and arranges for the composting of this material. The residual waste, green/food waste and the operation of the recycling centres all forms part of the Waste PFI contract with Donarbon.

The District Councils are responsible for kerbside recycling schemes and bring-banks e.g. bottle-banks. The greater the amount of waste recycled at the kerbside, the smaller the amount of residual waste the County Council has to deal with.

Over the 10 years of the RECAP partnership all partners have substantially increased their recycling rates. Indeed we now have some of the top performers in England in our partnership. The rates for recycling (%) and waste arisings per capita from kerbside and brings-banks (kg/person) for 2009/10 are:

Huntingdonshire District Council	55.54%	407 kg/person
South Cambridgeshire District Council	53.47%	420 kg/person
Fenland District Council	50.29%	431 kg/person
Peterborough City Council	44.61%	495 kg/person
Cambridge City Council	40.87%	361 kg/person
East Cambridgeshire District Council	37.15%	351 kg/person

RECAP Average 49.83%

National Average 39.5%

Whilst East Cambridgeshire District Council's performance is less than the average across RECAP, it is only marginally below the national average.

Costs incurred by the County Council as a result of a WCA's performance are twofold: the costs of treating the residual waste, and the recycling credit paid to the WCA for every tonne of waste it recycles.

The residual waste from the WCAs is processed through the Mechanical Biological Treatment Plant (MBT), and any unrecycled material is sent to landfill, which attracts Landfill Tax on top of the costs of processing. Landfill Tax is currently £48 per tonne and is due to rise by £8/te pa until it reaches at least £80/te.

The payment of recycling Credits to WCAs is a statutory duty that the County Council as a Waste Disposal Authority must discharge in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Waste and Recycling Payments) (England) Regulations 2006. The credits are intended to incentivise waste diversion from landfill, by moving the management of waste higher up the Waste Hierarchy in order to minimise its environmental impact.

Therefore it is correct to say that in principle, and outside any Recycling Payments paid by the County Council to the District Councils, a lower tonnage results in less disposal cost to this Authority.

Following the signing of the County Council's contract with Donarbon in March 2008, all the District Councils together with the County Council signed a Partnering Agreement, under which the District Councils agreed to use reasonable endeavours to at least maintain the recycling and other waste collection schemes that were in place at that time, and to inform the County Council as soon as reasonably practicable where changes to any collection arrangements are anticipated. The intention was to ensure that the emphasis on kerbside recycling was maintained to ensure that the capacity and lifetime of the MBT plant were not compromised.

Through the RECAP Partnership the County Council Waste Service continues to work with colleagues across all the District Councils in order to improve performance and realise efficiencies. Notably, earlier this year East Cambridgeshire completed a comprehensive review of their waste services. However, following the announcement last June by the new Secretary of State that she would be reviewing all waste policy, East Cambridgeshire decided to await the outcome of the review due in May 2011 before making any decisions about how best to proceed. Other opportunities are being discussed within the partnership, including exploring opportunities for even closer working as an Advanced Waste Partnership.

In summary, the issue of waste costs is very complex, but it is true to say that the Council seeks to reduce its costs for waste disposal by encouraging recycling by all the District Councils, working as a strong and effective waste partnership.

Question from Councillor K Bourke to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor Mac McGuire

In the case of the Park and Ride service, none of the usual procurement criteria, designed to ensure openness, transparency and non-discrimination, have been satisfied. When the current "agreement" was renewed five years ago the Park and Ride was a successful and profitable service, and destined to become more so. By renewing the current agreement the council permitted itself to bypass the standard procurement legislation and not to invite other major operators to provide the service. Consequently, the current agreement appears to provide an exclusive commercial opportunity for the present operator--the agreement is both anti-competitive and discriminatory.

Why were other operators not given the opportunity to provide this service?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

The Agreement between the County Council and Stagecoach to which Councillor Bourke refers was entered into in 2005 by the then Deputy Chief Executive for the Office of Environment and Community Services, using his delegated powers under the Council's Contract Regulations which enable contracts to be exempted from the regulations in appropriate circumstances.

However, as Councillor Bourke is aware, we are in the process of considering various options for the future of the Park and Ride bus service and will ensure that any new arrangement fully complies with all applicable rules and regulations.

Question from Councillor A Pellew to Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance

Having had the opportunity to review the data provided on the County Council website listing payments to suppliers over £500 (<http://goo.gl/g4vIB>) I have the following questions;

a) Can a way be found to uniquely identify individuals so that it becomes possible to determine whether or not any of the repeating payments to "Redacted Personal Data" or "Redacted Commercial Data" are to the same entity (maybe using the unique reference in the ERP system?) but to still ensure the privacy and anonymity of the entities? Payments to redacted entities accounted for 1.6M of spend in October *alone*. Is there a reason why this isn't being done already?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

We have been advised not to publish the supplier number (as the unique reference in the ERP system) on account of an increase in reported fraudulent activity at other Councils consequent on publishing spend data. For example, several Council's have been sent letters asking for changes to bank details for large suppliers but upon investigation the letters have not been sent from the companies in question. Internal Audit has asked us not to give out supplier numbers when asked for the same reason. We will explore other ways of achieving this aim, but further guidance from government is expected in the new year which may prescribe a way forward for all authorities.

b) Can you please provide the criteria under which commercial entities can qualify to have their information "Redacted" in these data feeds (approximately 85K of spend over the same period)?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

The commercial data that has been redacted to date is solely for care establishments where vulnerable and abused children/young people have been placed. Publishing the providers whose company name is that of the residential home raised a number of concerns, as by making this information available to the public it could possibly lead to the identification of locations where vulnerable children/young people had been placed. The decision was taken to redact the providers company name as by identifying where children/young people had been placed could inevitably put them at risk.

c) Can a changlog be included on the page (or published separately) so that where a file is updated a note is added?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

We are exploring this suggestion further. We do not have an easy means of doing what is suggested at present, however the changes made to date have largely been around the structure of the files as more guidance comes out rather than to the dataset itself, so we are hopeful provision of a changlog could be resourced. Government guidance awaited in the new year may be prescriptive on this so we will await this before finalising a solution.

d) Can the postcode of the entity be added to the data feeds?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

Information governance are considering this further however audit specifically advise against adding postcodes where the supplier name is redacted. Government guidance may well be prescriptive on this in the next few months. Adding postcodes where the supplier name is redacted poses a risk that individual vulnerable clients and care providers could be identified, so is not acceptable.

e) Can the total amount, not the breakdown, of spend under £500 be published as part of the feed?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Resources and Performance, Councillor Reynolds

A single line totalling all spend under £500 will be provided with the November data.

**COUNTY COUNCIL – 7TH DECEMBER 2010
ORAL QUESTIONS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 9.1**

1. Question to the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis, from Councillor Sedgwick-Jell

[AUDIO NOT CAPTURED AS MICROPHONE NOT ACTIVATED]

The question concerned the impact of the removal of the Education Maintenance Allowance on post-16 applications.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis

I don't know specifically. Obviously there is an issue there that we need to look at and its impact is on our young people, and of course we will do that and when we've done it I will make sure we copy anything to you.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis, from Councillor Sedgwick-Jell

[AUDIO NOT CAPTURED AS MICROPHONE NOT ACTIVATED]

The question concerned the lobbying of other authorities.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis

It depends on the impact. The trouble is with all of this, and I'm dealing with this in a lot of different areas at the moment, we could protest about every single thing that we are dealing with where there are cuts and impacts on people around this County. Actually the reality is that none of us want to be where we are at the moment but the truth is that once again the Conservatives along with the Liberal Democrats this time have come into power and have got a problem to deal with. If we protest about every single cut nothing gets done and this country stays in a black hole. So we've got a problem there but of course if there is a need for me to discuss that with my Cabinet colleagues and see if there is a need to lobby, yes we will do it.

2. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire, from Councillor K Bourke

My question is for Councillor McGuire, it's a follow up to one of the two written questions he very kindly responded to. The one about the Park & Ride and in that question I asked why with the renewal of the Park & Ride agreement five years ago that agreement wasn't competed, and his response is a technical legalistic answer. It doesn't explain why, it simply states that special powers were used to by-pass the usual procedural requirements. So it causes me some concern, I want to know why it wasn't competed, not what the powers used were. This is a serious question, a commercial agreement wasn't competed, and this would appear to be anti-competitive. You've given an exclusive commercial opportunity to one company in particular, the process seems to me extremely suspect so will you please explain why it wasn't competed?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access,
Councillor M McGuire**

Chairman, I can only give Councillor Bourke the answer that I have been given, which is around the Chamber. His question has not differed in any way. He hasn't given me notice of any alternative type of question so I can only repeat what is and which is available and refer him to that written answer.

**Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access,
Councillor M McGuire, from Councillor K Bourke**

Respectively the question doesn't differ from the one I asked first time around but respectively you didn't answer the question I asked first time around. It's a very clear question. I'm asking why, not how, this contract wasn't competed. As the Cabinet member for this portfolio and coming up to the renegotiation of that contract, you really need to be on top of this information if we are going to learn from the mistakes of last time. You need to know what they were. So will you please try a little bit harder and explain why that contract was not competed?

**Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access,
Councillor M McGuire**

Chairman for the benefit of Council as well as Councillor Bourke, I refer again to the answer he was given which stated that in 2005 the then Deputy Chief Executive for the Office of Environment and Community Services used his delegated powers under the Council's Contract Regulations. I see equally why no reason for Councillor Bourke to keep repeating the question. However, what I can inform him and the Council is that there is a paper on the Park & Ride coming to the Cabinet next week and I would suggest to Councillor Bourke if he wants to pick up any more information he might want to attend that, where he might hear what we propose to do in terms of the Park & Ride.

3. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck from Councillor P Reeve

There are two elements to it but they are related. The first element is could you offer me an assurance that in this time of austerity, when frontline jobs are being cut and frontline services are being cut, that this Council before we start cutting the people that are affecting outside services most, will first eliminate the non jobs that still exist in the Council such as those positions that evolve around climate change and CO₂ emissions? There are more than six people in full time employment by this Council in that role and their role is largely monitoring internal output, with absolutely no merit in terms of the overall picture whether you believe or not the outcome of climate change. The second part of my question is much closer to home and is linked. Again it is about austerity, this time as well removing non jobs before actual jobs that make a difference to people's lives, and would you undertake or agree with me that we should first show real leadership in this Council Chamber? Maybe consider eliminating Councillors' allowances and expenses in order to show the community that when things get tough we are the people that will be hit first.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck

Firstly, we are looking at the Council as a whole and that covers all departments, there are no sacred cows at all. We have to look after our most vulnerable and so that's why that comes first and we are looking at all posts. So climate change will not be any different from any others, we are looking very carefully at that area. The second part, real leadership. All of you in this Chamber know that when you meet with other Councillors around the country that actually we are probably, well we are one of the lowest paid, the lowest expenses in the country. I can only speak as I find but I think that if we look at the people in this Chamber the public gets more than value for money.

4. Question to the Cabinet Member for Communities, Councillor Sir P Brown, from Councillor S van de Ven

This Council's recent seminar on localism on the 24 November told us that the Government means business when it comes to the Big Society and that we are all expected not to wait for instructions but to get cracking on building the capacity of Cambridgeshire's residents and developing principles of volunteerism and initiative. Meanwhile a few weeks ago we opened the Addenbrooke's access road. However, we forgot to contact our Community Transport Schemes whose fleets of volunteer drivers transport patients to and from Addenbrooke's in their own cars with a small subsidy for petrol. We should have planned with them, both how to facilitate their use over the road and especially the automatic number plate recognition system which is set up to catch rat runners. This does not bode well in terms of joined up strategic thinking for localism and a big society and building the capacity of residents volunteering to fill in the gaps in public services. My question is for the Cabinet, and perhaps Councillor Sir Peter Brown as the champion for localism would be the most appropriate person to answer. How does the Cabinet intend to make a transformational step towards supporting the large volunteer base already established in Cambridgeshire, and as part two of my question would Councillor McGuire consider rectifying the lack of contact for community transport schemes and look to putting their drivers on the access roads white list?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Communities, Councillor Sir P Brown

I would just like to reassure Councillor van de Ven with regard to our policy on localism. We have been throughout the Council undertaking various pilot schemes and at the moment we are waiting for the publication of the Localism Bill which I think is coming before Parliament next week. Now we understand from our colleagues at Westminster that there will be no prerequisites in that Bill, it will be left entirely too local authorities as to how they interpret that Bill, which gives us a lot of scope for what we need to do in Cambridgeshire to encourage our voluntary services.

I have already met with the Cambridgeshire Council of Voluntary Service and I have met with the Chief Executive of ACRE with our officers. We are looking forward very much to working with them in the years and months ahead to ensure that the Voluntary Services in Cambridgeshire have the tools to undertake what we are going to want them to do. It's not just with the voluntary service, it's with our partners throughout Cambridgeshire. I would like to reassure you, I had a meeting yesterday afternoon with your representatives from Cambridge City to see how we can work with them in future with localism projects. So I hope that will reassure you that we are very serious about this agenda. I'm pleased in a way that the coalition left it to us to deal with because it does give us a blank sheet of paper on which to work.

**Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access,
Councillor M McGuire**

I wasn't aware that the Community Transport people in Cambridge were not allowed access, because it is after all an Addenbrooke's access road, so if their purpose is in going to the hospital then of course they are not going to be penalised for doing it. If however, they do receive the warning letters then they can of course respond and show that they have a legitimate reason for accessing Addenbrooke's and of course it will be waived anyway. If they have any difficulties they can always bring it up with us as Members, but I don't imagine they would have any difficulty with it. I guess it's one of those difficult situations for the ANPR system if it doesn't know that number but if you can give me examples from the Community Transport people who are not on this list then we will arrange for them to get on the list. Can I also refer you to the first question on the blue papers which Councillor Moss-Eccardt asked a similar question, which should explain how we get around that particular problem, it might be of help to you.

**5. Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck from
Councillor F Whelan**

We had a very informative IPP session last Friday and we know that the figures coming from central government are not going to be released for another week possibly another two. The concern that I have is that everybody in this Chamber represents either Parish Councils or Area Committees, all of whom are begging us to tell them what the details are going to be so they can set their precept. That precept has to be set very, very soon so that it can be given to District Councils. We're in the unenviable situation that our Parish Councils can read things in the Cambridge News we can't tell them. Can you let us know when that information is no longer going to be confidential so that we can actually tell our parishes what cuts they are likely to experience so that they can precept accordingly for the coming financial year?

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck

As you know we don't know, all we've done is as much work as we possibly can with the information that we have before us. So we cannot say and as you quite rightly said we're not expecting it now until after the end of next week. So there's nothing we can do. They can wait until January I understand for them to set the precepts so let's hope we've got some information then. You're right we are all in the same position.

**Supplementary Question to the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck from
Councillor F Whelan**

Can I just clarify so by the end of this month if those figures are in from Whitehall we will be able to go back to our Parish Councils and start to give them some breakdown of where they are likely to have to precept and start providing local services? I understand that some information is confidential but we need to be able to start giving them some details so that they can precept accordingly.

Reply from the Leader of the Council, Councillor J Tuck

It will of course be general at that point because we will not have set the budget and because it is such a dire situation we are in I want to make sure that we do the absolute best for everybody. So we will generally be able to but the actual detail, no.

6. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire, from Councillor D Jenkins

Chair you have quite rightly congratulated officers and all these various cycling schemes and I'm sure that cyclists out there when the weather is warmer will enjoy them. One of the flagship schemes that we were quite excited about, 18 months ago, was the B1049 cycling scheme, all the way down from Cottenham into the City. It has gone forward by fits and starts and it's currently in one of its unfit modes. We do get updates every so often after the fact, but Councillor McGuire could you go and get us an update from the officers and say why is it taking so long and what's another date for it to be completed? As currently nothing is being done on it.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

Chairman, I would but there maybe other questions so if you don't mind I'll wait until after the meeting and may be tomorrow try and find out.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire, from Councillor D Jenkins

Second point not relating to that cycle scheme though. There is a project to put a safer crossing across the A14 using some Section 106 money which already exists. Can he get us an update on that, because that is being managed in a different way and getting that information is even more difficult?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire

Thank you Chairman, if Councillor Jenkins has been unable for whatever reason to get the answers to these questions himself then I will take that up, but I do hope that generally Councillors will avail themselves of the facilities that allow them to go directly to and ask questions of officers. Every Councillor in this Chamber has that right to even approach the Chief Executive, if necessary, I'm sure he will concur with that.

7. Question to Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett from Councillor K Wilkins

This Council is in the process of retendering and awarding block contracts to residential care providers. Are such plans for this financial year on track?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett

Yes we are indeed as part of our regular process, we are looking at contracts across the patch and they are on track and will keep you advised as to the status of that.

Supplementary Question to Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett from Councillor K Wilkins

Thank you for that answer but that's not what I hear, where there have been delays in the consideration and awarding of contracts. Can I ask Councillor Yeulett to investigate that please and to say what measures the Council has already taken because of the problems that already exist to ensure that existing providers are able to meet the delays that have been caused?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett

I take note of what you say and I will take that forward and reply to you later.

8. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty, from Councillor P Downes

It's in relation to the recently published Education White Paper the Importance of Teaching. Does the Executive Member for Education agree with me that this paper seriously undervalues the contribution that local authorities make to the cost effective revision of school places, the support of school improvement, the speedy resolution of problems and the care that they enable for the most vulnerable and needy children and young people. The proposals in this White Paper in relation to the future role of local authorities are at best confused and at worst potentially destructive. If he does agree with me will he join me in urging the Government to specify clearly what the future role of the local authority will be as the state funded system of education disintegrates, ensure that adequate funding is available to fulfil whatever residual role the local authority has, prioritise the care for the most vulnerable who are most likely to be adversely affected in a dysfunctional environment and fourthly ensure that all schools are fairly funded and that the next financial advantage currently enjoyed by schools that become academies ceases immediately.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

I'd like to ask Councillor Curtis just to respond to this for you.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis

I've had a look at the draft White Paper and I've had conversations with a number of head teachers about it, everything is not perfect, there is a lot of clarification to provide. Actually by and large they are quite excited about being more in control of what they are doing, which is what the Academies Bill was all about and it's actually what the Education White Paper is about, which is trusting head teachers to deliver good education and for Government to get out of it. Sometimes that does mean local government as well. I think we've got a good record but let's not play around with this just being a Cambridgeshire issue, it's a national issue and not every local authority has the reputation and standing that we've got in Cambridgeshire. So let's not play the negative game on this, let's recognise what it's about which is about localism in schools as much as our solution as a County

Council is about moving forward with localist agenda as well. So I don't principally think that you are coming from it from the angle that is important to me, which is actually from what is right for our students and teachers and head teachers.

Supplementary Question to the Cabinet Member from Councillor P Downes

I don't disagree with your point that Cambridgeshire relative to many other local authorities has a good reputation and does a good job. My concern is that your principle responsibility as a County Councillor with responsibility for education and for young people in this County is to ensure that the local authority for which service, you are responsible, has got the funds to do what is expected of it and that is the assurance that I am seeking from you. Never mind what heads say about localism, that is your main responsibility and I want to hear you say very clearly that you will support this local authority to get the funds it needs to do the essential job.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Children, Councillor M Curtis

Of course we also know where Cambridgeshire sits in terms of funding. It's ranked 132 out of 151 authorities in the amount of funding it gets for its schools. We will of course continue to do what we have done for a number of years which is fight for a better deal for Cambridgeshire schools.

9. Question to the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty, from Councillor R West

I understand that St Neots Community College could be out of special measures as early as next term, after receiving a glowing report from OfSTED Inspectors. Could you please confirm? If so I'm sure the Chamber would like to offer full support to the head, staff, governors and students of that Community College.

Response from the Cabinet Member for Learning, Councillor D Harty

Yes I can say to you that certainly at this point in time, the feedback that we are getting with regard to the Federation, formed between the Community College in St Neots and the Longsands Community College, has moved forward well indeed and I think that we're very pleased with the response that we've had from the OfSTED report.

10. Question to Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett from Councillor C Shepherd.

We have had a lot of discussion in recent weeks about various health white papers that have come upon us thick and fast. Last week there was another one published 'Healthy Lives, Healthy People', together with an associated paper 'Our Health and Wellbeing Today' and both of these papers address the issue of public health, with the proposal that public health will be devolved fully from national government to local government and with an associated budget, I believe.

My question is first of all does Councillor Yeulett agree with me that whilst we must have of course the discussions about access to health and social care pathways, and people must have access to these in an efficient and effective way, the real gain behind good health for the County is to prevent people getting into these pathways and needing this health care in the first instance? If he does agree with me about that can he give me some indication about how the County might be taking forward this proposal to take back on board public

health and to start the vital response of getting health to people before they are down into the health pathways and needing healthcare for various services?

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett

Yes indeed prevention and intervention is one of the paths of the way forward as far as the Council is concerned across the patch. 'Healthy Lives, Healthy People' outlines considerable public health challenges facing the nation and Cambridgeshire. It focuses on health and wellbeing throughout life to ensure that everyone is supported to make healthy choices, choice and control is also one of our standard things there. It also emphasises the importance of addressing the wider determinance of health such as employment, educational achievements, environmental, social and cultural factors as well as housing across the patch, there we need to work with partners. It highlights the need to improve wellbeing, mental and physical as well as treating sickness and highlights the lead role with local government addressing this agenda, all areas we are involved in Cambridgeshire as a County Council. Work is already underway to drive forward work streams a draft response is being prepared for Cambridge Together which allows individual organisations to respond separately.

There will be a Cambridgeshire County Council response, which will be consulted on between now and the 8 March, probably with a discussion to Cabinet. Key issues include the balance between local and national public health functions, the resources available within the ring-fence, [this is the money that's coming down from Government we need to see how we are going to get that], and joint accountability between the Council and Public Health England. It is important to appreciate the Council will be responsible to the local population for its record of health improvements and health inequalities. In this case our Joint Strategic Needs Assessment will prove invaluable in addressing this. Elected members will have an important part to play in this. The democratic element runs through this and it is a very important thing to take into account. Also the importance of children must not be forgotten, views sought and how commissioning of health visiting and school nursing sought there. The transfer of public health responsibilities and staff to local authorities, we've got the problem of transferring staff across, working with District Councils with housing, consulting with GP Consortia which I've been doing, these are challenges and I welcome members' views through the Council process. We've got officer groups working on it, workshops, seminars, PDGs and other forums to help us put forward Cambridgeshire's response to the White Paper. This is an opportunity to work with our partners to deliver better health for the whole of our community.

Supplementary Question to Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett from Councillor C Shepherd.

Thank you for that reply, really in addition to all of that I was rather hoping that we could have some commitment that you'll be joined up within the various budgets within this own Council. So that we are looking very carefully at the health and social care budget, which even right now we're discussing and debating of where there is an element of prevention but we need to know that is being joined up and included within this debate from the public health perspective but the two are not discussed separately.

Reply from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Health & Wellbeing, Councillor F Yeulett

It's implicit in our IPP process that we look at using resources across the whole of the County, all departments jointly where we can, within that and integrating across that. The point I made about the money coming down from Government, we must ensure that goes to public health in those areas. Government are ring fencing that and that should go through to that.

11. Question to the Cabinet Member for Highways and Access, Councillor M McGuire, from Councillor J Palmer

Could you please assure the Council? Could you let us know in the light of the recent poor weather how many salt gritting runs have been completed by the Council? How much salt is used per run? and how much salt is left in stock at this moment in time?

Reply from the Deputy Leader of Council, Councillor M McGuire

I am able to tell him and to tell Council that we have in fact got some 6,100 metric tonnes left but we also, of course, have access if we need to additional stocks at the Highways Agency located at Whittlesford. Sixteen runs have actually been completed during this bad period we've recently experienced and still experiencing and approximately 200 tonnes are used on each normal precautionary run, those were the figures as of yesterday. I can add to that if I may take this opportunity to say that colleagues will have seen the publicity surrounding the quad bike system that we have leased and the additional knapsack spreaders we are using for footpaths and that sort of thing. The quad bike has actually been out five times already and the knapsacks have also been out several times.

But can I also take this opportunity because it's often seen by many of our employees that when it comes to matters around gritting it becomes a political football and no less so this week when we see some of the press releases that have gone out. I would like to take this opportunity and I'm sure everybody in this Council will want to join me in thanking our staff who have been out doing this. We've not been as we all know the worse part of the country, there are many parts that are considerably worse, I was talking to my family in Scotland last night and by gosh we think we've got problems! Can I just say I'd like to pass on to our officers from this Council our best wishes and thanks for what they are doing for the public.

12. Question to the Leader of Council, Councillor J Tuck , from Councillor R Moss-Eccardt

As it seems that some members of her Cabinet seem to believe that powers when the delegated authors delegate the responsibility as well, will she therefore take proportionately away from each of their SRAs the powers that have been delegated and save that money?

Reply from the Leader of Council, Councillor J Tuck

I'm afraid I don't understand the question, I'm sorry if it's just me but what do you mean?

Councillor R Moss-Eccardt

In an answer earlier, one of her Cabinet members said that a decision was made under delegated powers and he seemed to then believe that also meant the responsibility went with the delegation of the power. If that is the case then there is no reason for SRAs for those powers that have been delegated.

Reply from the Leader of Council, Councillor J Tuck

I don't think you understand what happens within Cabinet, I'm afraid, I'm quite happy to talk to you outside of here about what delegated powers means. That's why I didn't understand the question, I thought there must surely be something else. There is no way you delegate the power and responsibility like that, but delegated powers doesn't quite follow that pattern. Happy to talk to you outside.

Supplementary Question to the Leader of Council, Councillor J Tuck , from Councillor R Moss-Eccardt

Therefore my supplementary is will she talk with her Cabinet member who is confused and make sure he continues to take responsibility for the powers he's delegated?

Reply from the Leader of Council, Councillor J Tuck

Because it's Councillor McGuire who is being attacked via me, he's quite happy to answer.

Reply from the Deputy Leader of Council, Councillor M McGuire

Chairman, Councillor Moss-Eccardt is labouring under some strange misapprehension of the powers of this Council. It is quite common in local authorities to delegate certain powers down to officers and the Chief Executive downwards, there's nothing unusual about that. What I would say and I will stand by it, is that while we can delegate authority none of us in this Cabinet has ever delegated this responsibility.